

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed April 9, 2009 and the Advisory Action mailed June 15, 2009.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed April 9, 2009, Claims 1-28 and 30-44 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1, 4, 6-15, 18, 20-28, 30, 33, and 35-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hawley (PCT Publication No. WO 01/77822 A2). Claims 2-3, 5, 16-17, 19, 31-32, and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawley in view of Secor et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0027845, hereafter Secor).

II. Summary of Applicants' Amendments

The present Reply amends Claims 1, 15 and 44, cancels Claims 8, 10-11, 22, 24-25 and 30-43; and adds Claims 45-62, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-7, 9, 12-21, 23, 26-28 and 44-62. Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

In the Office Action mailed April 9, 2009, Claims 1, 4, 6-15, 18, 20-28, 30, 33, and 35-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hawley (PCT Publication No. WO 01/77822 A2).

Claim 1

As amended, Claim 1 recites:

1. *(Currently Amended) A method for dynamically binding a user interface to information stored in a data source, comprising:
displaying a user interface, wherein the user interface is operable to
display information in a web page, wherein the information is stored in a
first data source on a business object,
collect additional information from a user, and
store the additional information in the first data source on the business
object;
providing a data binding tag that defines*

*a rendering boundary within the web page for rendering the information,
and
rules to be applied when the information is rendered, wherein the data
binding tag includes a plurality of attributes;
specifying, by the data binding tag, a first action which includes reading or
updating the information stored in the first data source, wherein at least one of the
attributes is associated with the first action;
specifying the first data source associated with the first action using a script; and
rendering each item in the first data source on the web page in the user interface
with a markup language according to the boundary and the rules defined by the data
binding tag and based on the first action, including evaluation of the script.*

As amended, Claim 1 recites displaying a user interface, wherein the user interface is operable to display information in a web page, wherein the information is stored in a first data source on a business object, collect additional information from a user, and store the additional information in the first data source on the business object; providing a data binding tag that defines a rendering boundary within the web page for rendering the information, and rules to be applied when the information is rendered, wherein the data binding tag includes a plurality of attributes; specifying, by the data binding tag, a first action which includes reading or updating the information stored in the first data source, wherein at least one of the attributes is associated with the first action; specifying the first data source associated with the first action using a script; and rendering each item in the first data source on the web page in the user interface with a markup language according to the boundary and the rules defined by the data binding tag and based on the first action, including evaluation of the script.

Hawley discloses that a user-interface (963) of a device (903) renders a first object (360) and a second object (360), each object with data of a business application (300). (Abstract). It is a task of the [invention] to define a framework, wherein the framework defines classes of applications (300) that share a common user interface model. By defining a dedicated rendering statement (245) in application specification language, and by adapting an interpreter, the [invention] allows to create applications (300) for different types of computing devices (901/902/903), even if the device is not yet present when the application is developed. (Page 8, lines 25-35). Interpreter component 200 provides a basic user-interface framework. The framework comprises a navigation model, binding data to user-interface elements, data-services such as validation, inter-object relationships and navigation, data-event control, and capture of data changes, and middleware services such as data synchronization, and virtual request-reply. (Page 14, lines 25-30). To set the value of an attribute of a particular element, the developer

selects the element in tree-viewer 255 (cf. FIG. 6, FIG. 11). Workbench component 250 determines the list of all possible attributes for this element by inspection of AS-Language 260, and displays them in element attribute panel 255 of workbench component 250. (Page 35, line 33 to page 36, line 4).

Claim 1, as amended, recites specifying, by the data binding tag, a first action which includes reading or updating the information stored in the first data source, wherein at least one of the attributes is associated with the first action.

Applicant respectfully submits that Hawley does not appear to disclose a data binding tag as recited by Claim 1. Instead, Hawley appears to disclose an interpreter component that is used to provide a framework that comprises binding data to user-interface elements, and a workbench component GUI that may be used to set attribute values.

Furthermore, in Hawley, neither component appears to specify a first action as recited by Claim 1. Instead, in Hawley, the interpreter component appears to provide a framework and the workbench component is an interface. Applicant respectfully submits that Hawley does not disclose or render obvious specifying, by the data binding tag, a first action which includes reading or updating the information stored in the first data source, wherein at least one of the attributes is associated with the first action, as recited by Claim 1, as amended.

Claim 1, as amended, also recites specifying the first data source associated with the first action using a script.

Applicant respectfully submits that Hawley does not disclose specifying the first data source associated with the first action using a script, as recited by Claim 1, as amended. Instead, Hawley appears to describe that a "common scripting language" can be used to enhance the functionality of an interpreter component. However, in Hawley, the interpreter component does not appear to specify the first data source associated with the first action; but instead appears to present an application to a user and provide a basic user interface to the user. Applicant respectfully submits that Hawley does not appear to disclose specifying the first data source associated with the first action using a script, as recited by Claim 1.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as currently amended, is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 15, 30 and 44

Claim 30 has been canceled, rendering moot the rejection of this claim. The comments provided above with respect to Claim 1 are hereby incorporated by reference. Claims 15 and 44 have been similarly amended to more clearly recite the embodiments therein. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 15 and 44, as amended, are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 4, 6-14, 18, 20-28, 33 and 35-43

Claims 8, 10-11, 22, 24-25, 33 and 35-43 have been canceled, rendering moot the rejection of these claims. Claims 4, 6-7, 9, 12-14, 18, 20-21, 23 and 26-28 depend from and include all of the features of Claims 1 or 15. Claims 4, 6-7, 9, 12-14, 18, 20-21, 23 and 26-28 have not been addressed separately herein; however, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable at least as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the amendments to the independent claims, and the comments provided above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action mailed April 9, 2009, Claims 2-3, 5, 16-17, 19, 31-32, and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawley in view of Secor (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0027845).

Claims 31-32 and 34 have been canceled, rendering moot the rejection of these claims. Claims 2-3, 5, 16-17 and 19 depend from and include all of the features of Claims 1, 15, or 30. Claims 2-3, 5, 16-17 and 19 have not been addressed separately herein; however, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable at least as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the amendments to the independent claims, and the comments provided above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

V. Additional Amendments

Claims 45-62 have been newly added by the present Reply. Applicant respectfully requests that new Claims 45-62 be included in the Application and considered herewith.

VI. Request for Interview

In the event the above remarks fail to place the case in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests the opportunity to interview with the Examiner at the Examiner's convenience, and prior to the issuance of a subsequent Office Action, to assist in expediting prosecution. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

VII. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 9, 2009

By: /Nathan L. Feld/
Nathan L. Feld
Reg. No. 59,725

Customer No. 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800